IDENTITY AND SOCIAL NETWORKS AMONG FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

by

HUONG THI LE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

August 2010

Major Subject: Sociology

IDENTITY AND SOCIAL NETWORKS AMONG FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

by

HUONG THI LE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Jane Sell
Committee Members,	Stuart Hysom
	William McIntosh
Head of Department,	Mark Fossett

August 2010

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

Identity and Social Networks Among First Generation
College Students. (August 2010)
Huong Thi Le, B.A., Texas A&M University
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Jane Sell

This thesis focuses on first generation college students and their unique social positions in social and institutional networks. First generation students are less likely to attend college than non-first generation students. I examine what factors make a student more likely to self-report student success by considering formation of a new identity, "college student," as well as looking at networks and role behaviors consistent with the new identity. It was predicted that those that were consistent with behaviors and identity would self-report academic success at a higher rate. I also predicted that overall, first generation students would be at a disadvantage compared to non-first generation students. Survey data collected from a large university in the southwest was utilized for analysis.

First generation students are less likely to report academic success compared to their non-first generation peers. However, when more variables are considered within a binomial regression analysis, first generation status is no longer a significant influence on success. Other factors such as hours per week engaged in homework, involvement in learning communities, and ethnicity had an effect on self-reported success. Those who

spent more hours per week doing homework or were involved in learning communities were more likely to self-report academic success. Whites were also more likely to report academic success than non-whites.

Several policy implications are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their feedback and comments while writing. Especially my committee chair, Dr. Jane Sell. Dr. Sell has been the most helpful and caring mentor and advisor. Without her constant support and guidance, this thesis would have never been written. She has continuously supported me during times of doubt, and encouraged me to succeed when I lacked confidence. Dr. Sell has been more than helpful and more than instrumental in my success during graduate school.

I would also like to thank my family, friends, husband, and puppies for their support during my thesis-writing journey. They all provided an outlet for me when I needed it most, whether it be emotional support, venting, or comical distractions. Especially those puppies. Bless their adorableness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Higher education is becoming more accessible to a growing and diversifying group of individuals. In October 2008, 39.6% (11.5 million) of young adults ages 18-24 were enrolled in college (both 2 and 4 year degrees). That is a considerable increase from the 24% enrolled in 1973 (Fry 2009). Higher education has been linked to better overall health (Cutler & Lleras-Muney 2010) and more income over a lifetime (Day & Newburger 2002). With the advent of more scholarships and financial aid for those who qualify, students who do not have the financial means to attend school have new possibilities (Linsenmeier, Rosen & Rouse 2006; Van der Klaauw 2002). First generation students are those from a family where the parent/guardian does not have a degree. Overrepresented in this group are minorities and those who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Ting 2003).

First generation college students have a unique experience in a university setting compared to their peers that are not first generation. They often have familial and financial issues that can hinder their academic success (Horn & Nunez 2000). First generation

---

This thesis follows the style of *Social Psychology Quarterly*.

college students are different from college students who are not first generation in a variety of ways, including family structure and income (Ting 2003), access to opportunities (Horn & Nunez 2000; Kuh et al 2008), parental involvement (Davis-Kean 2005; Perna & Titus 2005), and self-efficacy (Vuong, Brown-Welty & Tracz 2010). First generation college students generally have a more difficult time gaining access to postsecondary education, as well as remaining enrolled and attaining a degree (Horn & Nunez 2000). In addition, another big factor in student success concerns the parents and their involvement in the student's education as well as their own level of education. Parental involvement and education level can be seen as social capital that is transferred to the student (Davis-Kean 2005; Dearing et al 2001; Dubow 2009; Perna 2000; Perna & Titus 2005) that can aid in college success. Perna (2000) found that college enrollment was comparable for Hispanics and Whites after controlling for costs, benefits, ability and social and cultural capital. Lower rates of enrollment for Hispanics can be attributed to lower levels of the types of capital that are required for college enrollment (test scores, curriculum, etc). Davis-Kean's (2005) finding lend some support that parent's SES, beliefs and home behaviors are related to children's achievement while Perna and Titus (2005) found that parental involvement is related to college enrollment, even after controlling for economic capital and cultural and human capital. However, there is an additional issue, one less investigated: the issue of identity and the formation of a new identity that is not a "usual" one in the student's primary network.

To conceptualize the issues related to first generation college students and their unique social positions, I will consider several different literatures. These literatures in-

clude the empirical literature on first generation students and their characteristics, and the theoretical literature on identity theory and social networks.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Identity

There are differing types of theories that center upon the concept of identity. In social psychology, the concepts of identities are intertwined with concepts of societal structure and social networks. Well- known social psychological identity theories that both focus on identity verification include identity theory or identity control theory (see Burke 2007), affect control theory (see Heise 2007) and Swann's verification theory (Swann et al 1989). These three perspectives center upon the idea that people seek out evidence for confirming or verifying their identities. Not all identity theories focus on this verification notion; for example, Kaplan (1983) focuses on the assumption that people seek self-enhancement.

Identity Control Theory (ICT) focuses on how a person defines *who they are* and the relationship between that identity and their behavior, within a social structure in which the identities are embedded. ICT started in identity theory and symbolic interaction theory. A central idea in these types of theories is that behavior is based on a world that is named and classified. People within this world name and identify themselves as well as others with respect to the positions they occupy. These labels have meanings and expectations attached to them, and it is these meanings and expectations that become part of the person's identity by internalization. These self labels define people in terms of their position in society along with carrying shared behavior expectations. They are

also relational, as they tie people together through shared meanings. Social structure, in this view, is not fixed (Burke 2007).

The meaning through which identities are formed is a key concept within ICT. What does it *mean* to be a mother, sister, or first generation college student? Burke states that "an identity is a set of meanings applied to the self in a social role or as a member of a social group that define who one is" (Burke 2007: 2). Simply put, the definition of meaning can be seen as a response to a stimulus. Thinking of oneself as "X" brings forth a set of responses (meanings) similar to those called up in others. These responses define what it *means* to be X, Y, or Z. Common responses lead to common expectations about what X is and does (Burke 2007).

Every identity is seen as a control system. Burke outlines the control system with a cybernetic model using a feedback loop. There are four components: 1) *the identity standard* (meaning of the identity to the actor), 2) *perceptions* of meanings in the situation (relevant to identity), 3) a *comparator* which compares perceived meanings with that of the identity standard, which also functions as an output of the comparison (error/discrepancy) that indicates the different between the meaning and the standard. And 4) *meaningful behavior in the situation*, a function of the error, that transmits meaning about our identity. In a setting, if people perceive their identity-relevant meanings as matching the meanings of their identity standard, people will continue their actions (since they are getting what they need—identity verification). If, however, there is some discrepancy, people will change their behavior in order to get the meanings and stan-

dards to once again match. *Changing the behavior changes meanings in the situation*. So once again, the individual will compare the meanings to the standard. Therefore, each identity is a control system that seeks to control perceptions (identity-relevant meanings) by matching them to their identity standards, discarding any discrepancy caused by the interruption. This cycle is the process of identity verification. People act in ways that verify their identities, and in doing so, will put themselves in the position for their meanings and identity standards to be consistent. The meanings in the identity standard signify goals, or the way the situation is supposed to be. "If the identity is a role identity, then the behavior that brings about the changes in the situational meanings to make them consistent with the identity standard is appropriate role behavior" (Burke 2007: 2-3). In terms of a group identity, the behavior used for verification is that which maintains group boundaries in the social structure. So, the process of identity verification not only creates but maintains the social structure that the identities are embedded in (Burke 2007).

ICT has three kinds of identities. *Role identities* show what it means to be in a role such as a "father". *Social identities* show what it means to be a in a group or category such as "American." *Person identities* show what it means to be the unique biological entity that one is. Each bases act in the same way, where people attempt to verify their identities by making the situational meanings match the meanings of the identity standard by balancing any interruptions. For each, different resources are controlled through the control of meaning. People have multiple identities. This complexity regarding the self mirrors the complexity of society. The identities, in ICT, are arranged on a

hierarchy of control systems where some identities are higher than others in the sense that the output of the higher level identities is the standards for the lower level identities (Burke 2007).

The most common occurrence from discrepancy between the perceived identity relevant meanings and the identity standard is behavior that offsets any disruption and brings meanings back in line with the identity standard. However, ICT also addresses identity change (the identity standard slowly changes in the direction of the situational meaning). Both of these occur at the same time, just at different speeds. If the interrupted meaning is quickly fixed, any change to the standard could go unnoticed. In the case of persistence disturbance, however, the identity standard will continue to change slowly in the direction of the situational meaning and the person will begin to see him/her-self as being consistent with those meanings. The discrepancy was removed by changing the identity standard to match the situation meaning, and not the other way around. Identity verification is tied to emotion. If the incongruity between the perception and the standard is small or decreasing, people will feel good. If the difference is large or increasing, people will feel bad or distressed. This takes a bit of time and most people would leave the situation as opposed to enduring the slow changes to who they are (Burke 2007). This point will bring us to the purpose of this study, to be examined further on.

Swann's self-verification theory (Swann et al 1989, 1992, 2000, 2007, 2009) follows in the tradition of self-consistency theories (Festinger, Lecky, Secord and Backman) but diverges by abandoning the idea that people are interested in consistency for its

own sake. People want to confirm their self-conceptions in order to reinforce their perceptions and predictions and control. They want to understand mental and social life. Self-view can be described as self-concept, self-esteem, or a firm belief or feeling about oneself. Self-verification theory (SVT) assumes that the key to successful social relationships is the ability to recognize how others perceive you. People see how others respond and internalize the responses as self-concepts. In general, people want to be seen according to their self-views, which are maintained through self-verification strivings. People begin to prefer evaluations that confirm their self-concepts and avoid those that do not as positive evaluations create a semblance of stability. People are motivated to self-verify in order to have stable self-views. With such, they'll be able to handle the flux of social life. Also, being understood eases social interaction while being misunderstood creates unease.

The concept of SVT competes with another—self-enhancement. Self-enhancement perspectives assumes that, overall, people want positive reviews (regardless of whether or not *their* self-views are positive). If someone has a positive self-view, self-enhancement works with them as they want to self-verify enhancing self-views. However, if a person has a negative self-view, this clashes with the concept of self-enhancement. Swann states that self-verification tends to win over self-enhancement when people feel very strongly about the self-view and when the self-view is depressive. For example, it can cause people to move towards abusive partners, or leave a spouse/partner that sees them too favorably. SVT suggests that people will begin to shape others' views of them before the interaction even takes place through identity cues

and impression management (clothing, body language, cars, etc). Swann suggests that people are biased. They see things as more supportive than they really are (conscious or deliberate) and listen to those that confirm their self-views and ignore those that do not. Overall, they interpret things in such a way that reinforces self-views.

Kaplan's (1986) theory of self-referent behavior (SRB; a self-enhancement theory) conceptualizes a person as similar to two separate individuals—there is one who *acts* and one who *reacts* to the behavior of the actor. People that perform the behaviors are also the objects of that same behavior. "The person is the knower and the known, the one who feels and the object of the feeling, the person who judges and the one who is evaluated" (Kaplan 1986: 1). Self-referent behavior belongs to the category of human social behavior, which can be seen as any behavior by an individual or group that can serve as a stimulus for, or response to the (real or imagined past, present, or future) behavior of another individual or group. This definition serves to remind us that the behavior does not have to be "real" to be labeled 'social.' A belief can invoke a response, whether that belief is real or imagined, just as a past memory or anticipation of a person's behavior can become a stimulus. Kaplan outlines four modes of self-referent responses: 1) self-referent cognition, 2) self-evaluation, 3) self-feelings, and 4) self-protective/self-enhancing responses. His theory rests on the assumption that individuals need positive responses. All behaviors and responses are geared towards receiving that positive feedback from the actor himself, as well as in interactions with others. If an actor does not receive positive feedback, the actor will engage in self-protective/self-enhancing responses in order for the scale to measure towards the positive once more.

While they do differ, these theories all concern identity and interaction. ICT sees identities as a set of meanings, SVT sees people attempting to confirm their identities for consistency and SRB sees identities as a collection of stimuli and responses. They all work together in explaining how various individuals form and maintain their self-concept through social interaction.

Identity plays a vital role in an individual's life. It can be defined as the set of meanings that people hold for themselves that define what it "means" to be who they are. There are various ways that identity can be looked at. Some perspectives focus on social structures and how they are linked to identity (Serpe 1987; Stryker & Burke 2000), others focus on people's motivations to seek either consistent or enhancing feed-back (Burke & Harrod 2005), and still others assert that identity is contingent up being categorized within certain groups and the in-group/out-group comparison (Stets & Burke 2000). Ultimately this research focuses on ICT (2007) because it addresses the ways in which an actor defines who he is through labels having specific meanings which are in-ternalized as identities. If identities are not verified, actors will change their actions as to receive such verification and/or change the situation to their favor. By donning the label "first generation college student," students will need to work on verifying this new iden-tity through social interactions as well as personal/network goals.

Burke's work on identity focuses on the internal processes which bring forth be-havior. In particular situations, an individual's perceptions of an identity will surface. Individuals will seek to have the audience's (in an interaction) definition of the identity

match the definition that the actor applies to him/her-self. This process (the aforementioned cybernetic model with feedback loop) is called identity verification. When one can achieve identity verification, positive feelings are elicited. On the other hand, when an individual is unable to obtain identity verification, it causes negative feelings (Burke 2007).

Burke (2004) outlines some ways that Identity Control Theory (ICT) should be seen as a theory about the connection between identity and social structure. He points out that the identities being verified are most often given by culture. Culture is the context here. Social structure should be considered since how a person verifies his/her identity is based largely on their resources and means which is something that is provided by the social structure. An individual's culture/social structure will dictate how s/he will be able to incorporate the new identity into his/her existing one based on the cultural aspects associated with that new label. One must also consider the fact that the social structure is produced and reproduced through the process of identity verification. Having a role identity verified helps to sustain that role and its counterroles. Having a group identity verified helps to sustain and maintain the group and the in-group/out-group division.

Burke has conducted many studies in conjunction with others concerning identity and social structure (Burke & Stets 1999; Cast, Stets & Burke 1999; Stets & Burke 2005). These studies demonstrate that identity verification leads to committed relationships, emotional attachments, and group orientation, which are all characteristics of a

stable social structure. Also, when identity is disrupted at the micro level it threatens social relations at the meso level which affect the social structure (macro level). It can be shown how the social psychological processes uphold the social structure by showing the impact it has on psychological processes and that the self is not static or stationary. It is constantly shaped and maintained. It can change at any time due to an ongoing personal context. The research suggests that a person's relative status can alter this process.

Self-processes and trust have a hand in influencing the growth of commitment in society thereby making social order possible (Burke & Stets 1999). The process of self-verification leads (indirectly and directly) to the development of committed relationships, positive emotional attachments, and a group orientation, through positive emotions and trust; all of which are characteristics of a stable social structure. Burke and Stets believe that having your identity constantly verified in interaction causes certain consequences: increased trust for others, commitment to those others, increased emotional attachment to those others and the feeling that you are part of a group. So, through repeated identity verification, an individual will acquire knowledge of others' character and will eventually come to trust those people. Positive self-feelings will also induce trust and trust will induce feelings of confidence and security. It should also cause a positive emotional attachment.

Another important aspect concerning identity is its connection to role performance and power. Burke and Cast (1997) show that the idea of the self is relatively stable and maintained by a continuous process of self-verification. However, identity standards

can change due to a disruption of the process or by some external event. Burke and Cast point out that the continuous mismatches that lead to this kind of identity change are likely under certain circumstances, such as *role transitions*, when the self experiences a speedy shift in social conditions. Adopting a new role means reorganizing the social environment. An individual cannot remove him/her-self from the situation as a way to achieve balance. This study demonstrates how gender identity may adapt over time to changing cultural definitions. When there is a shift in the formation of a new identity, there can be a change in role performance due to the transition. Agency and power also take a part in this. Those that have more power will be more likely to have their identities verified and will be more likely to define the situation in their favor (Cast 2003). Those that have more agency will perhaps feel less stress associated with a particular role (Tsushima & Burke 1999).

First Generation College Students

Current research on First Generation College Students (FGCS) has been, for the most part, directed toward describing students' background and experiences during their first year of college (Pike & Kuh 2005). These kind of studies look at students' involvement in extra-curricular activities, housing, family environment, etc. Other studies have examined attrition rates in conjunction with certain "characteristics" that set one up for success in college (Ishitani 2006). Ishitani found that FGCS had a higher risk of departure (leaving the university) through their college years than their non-FGCS peers. Certain "pre-college characteristics" such as high school academic attributes help mediate

that gap. FGCS who graduated from high school with extra academic skills and from a more intense program were more likely to persist in college. Some research has elaborated to their second and third years (Pascarella et al 2004). Overall, FGCS complete less credit-hours than their peers as well as work more hours per week. They are less likely to live on campus, which hinders their involvement in extra-curricular activities.

Additionally, there have been studies that focus on the *students'* perspective and attitude about their own readiness for college (Reid & Moore 2008). Urban students in this study claimed that they lacked parental guidance, adequate high school preparation, and rigorous scholastic preparation. Additionally, FGCS have an alternative mindset concerning college which views it as a means to an end: a better job. Much research has been done on FGCS success, but few have looked at the motivation behind an individual who seeks higher education. Olive (2008) did just that and found that self-efficacy, positive high school experiences, a desire to move upwards socio-economically, and positive role-models (among others) were all factors in making possible the desire for higher education for Hispanic students. There were some separate factors to consider, but the interrelationship produced psychological meaning that was necessary for that desire to take place.

While much of the literature on FGCS points toward the family as a hindrance to the success of the student in college. Some studies show that the opposite can occur, the family can be seen as an asset that aids the student in college. Gofen (2009),in his work in Israeli FGCS, found that all the students cited their family as their reason for success.

Family is seen as a resource. Herndon and Hirt (2004) studied Black students and their families and found that there is a strong correlation between family cohesion and Black student success. The parents (can) provide and environment that influences how students perceive education. Orbe (2008) attempts to advance an interdisciplinary framework for understanding FGCS by trying to understand how they perform multiple aspects of their personal, social, and cultural identities. Two dialectical tensions seems explicitly relevant to identity negotiation, that of individual and society, and stability and change. Successful negotiation of this tension is crucial for academic success in college.

Social Networks

The basic elements of a network are nodes and connections. In sociology, nodes have been replaced with actors and connections with social ties. So, a "social network consists of a series of direct and indirect ties from one actor to a collection of others, whether the central actor is an individual person or an aggregation of individuals (e.g. a formal organization)" (Davern 1997: 3). A social bond between two actors is a network tie. The relations in the structure are the social ties connecting actors to one another. Social networks are flexible since ties are formed and broken as the social structure changes. There are four basic parts of social networks: 1) the *structural* component, 2) the *resource* component, 3) the *normative* component, and 4) the *dynamic* component.

The structural component points to the geometric shape of the actors and ties within a network, in addition to the strength of said ties. This is the building block of network analysis. All actors are seen as nodes which are affected by the configuration of

the social ties and various actions/actors within the network. The arrangement of the actors and nodes is very important. Take for instance three actors, all tied to one another in a network. The structure would be triangular. If, however, one person connects the other two within a network, then the structure is a straight line. The various shapes signify different consequences. In the straight line structure, one person has more relative power than the other two. In the triangular shape, all actors have equal power. These kinds of power differentials can explain the differences in exchange. One can also consider the strength of the social tie or bond between actors. There are many criteria with which to measure the strength of a bond: length of time spent together, business, emotions, "like" or "dislike" for one another, etc. Therefore, the structural aspect of a social network looks at both the tie's strength as well as the geometrical connections.

The resource component focuses on the distribution of various characteristics that often differentiate within a society among actors (such as gender, class, ethnicity, knowledge, etc). Resources are things that actors can turn to when they need help in achieving a goal. It takes into account an actor's resources that differentiate among people in a similar network. These resources can be individual or network characteristics. By analyzing the network distribution of a particular resource, a researcher is able to see the mount of non-structural resources accessible to an actor through his/her network ties. Resources are seen as a function of the actor's as well as his/her contacts.

The normative component refers to the norms and rules that shape the behavior of actors within different networks. It is also concerned with type of tie or social bond,

which is determined by looking at the social roles connected through a tie. The norms and rules can help or hinder processes of exchange, such as the level of trust within a network, the rules of a network, and the sanctions for enforcing said rules within a network. This can have some socioeconomic consequences, as some will be better able to perform functions than others. Also, there are different norms for each kind of bond between actors. All roles have a set of expectations and rules. Whether a tie is kin, a co-worker, etc has an inference for social and economic behavior. The dynamic component looks at the opportunities and constraints for the formation of ties and the network structure, which is always evolving. Networks are constantly changing since ties are created and broken over time (Davern 1997).

The social capitalists, Bourdieu (1986) and Coleman (1988), distinguish among varying forms of capital: economic, cultural, and social. Networks are constantly changing due to the breakdown and formation of new ties. Bourdieu sees cultural capital as unconsciously acquired through the time period, society and social class. Social capital is made up of connections and is the total of the actual or potential resources linked to a network. These sorts of relationships can be guaranteed by the use of a common name, such as that of a family, class, party or school. According to Coleman, social capital is not very tangible since it exists in the relations among people. It helps produce activity, just as physical and human capital do. Coleman points out that social capital does not live solely in the family; it can be found in the community as well through social relationships that exist among parents and in the parents' relations with the community.

Bourdieu and Coleman's observations have led to a number of studies focusing on the concept of social/human capital. Lin (1999) conceptualizes two types of resources: personal and social. Personal resources are possessed by the individual and s/he can use and get rid of them without much thought. Social resources are accessible through one's ties, directly or indirectly. According to Lin, achieved status, such as education and prior occupation, remain the most important factor in attaining the "ultimate" status. He suggests more research be conducted centering on differential access to social capital, as it is possible that social groups have differing access to social capital due to their (dis)advantaged structural positions and social networks. Along those lines, McNamara Horvat et al (2003) observed how parental networks differ drastically by social class while children's activities played a vital role in determining the shape of the parents' network. However, no matter the social class, informal connections between parents, when present, were largely engendered through children's out of school activities (middle-class children have higher participation rates). This research suggests the idea that networks linking parents of school peers is a middle-class phenomenon, as they will have more contact with one another since children of the middle-class are more likely to be involved in extra-curricular activities.

There have also been some studies that specifically look at the Mexican-American experience of social networks. Ream (2003) discusses the effect that unstable social networks, along with high mobility rates, have on Mexican-American underachievement. Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch (1995) also looked at Mexican-American students. In looking at school inequality, success within the educational system, for

working class and minorities, depends upon forming genuinely supportive relationships with institutional agents. They argue that ties with institutional agents symbolize a needed condition for advancement in the educational system. However, in working-class and minority groups, supportive ties are mostly found outside of the family, in school settings and community organizations. Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch believe in the importance of institutional agents and frame it in terms of social capital. Those in the working class have less capital hen those in the middle-class. This study gathers some support for the idea that Mexican-American high school students with higher grades and status expectations will generally have greater social capital than their peers with lower grades and expectations. Alternatively, Goddard's (2003) findings show a modest positive relationship between social capital and student achievement, with SES not being a significant predictor of said achievement, alone or with social capital.

Social Support

Related to the general idea of networks is the social support literature. This literature emphasizes the role that family and friends and co-workers can play in the perception of emotional support. As cited by Thoits (1995), there is usually a distinction made between the functional aspect of social networks in terms of emotional support and

structural social support which is more akin to the network approach which emphasizes the organization of the ties and the amount of time involved. Social support would be important for the development of identity and I use this idea of social support as vehicle for establishing identities either consistent or inconsistent with the identity of college student.

CHAPTER III

THEORY

Based upon the literature reviewed, I develop a theoretical framework to analyze first generation college students. This theoretical framework uses the concept of identity. Generally, given that an individual has little experience with an identity at time one, and given that the identity is chosen (rather than imposed), how can the chosen identity be successful (or verified) at time two? This relates to the identity of college student, a chosen identity but one for which first generation students have little if any familial experience. With little experience, verification and consequently success at the identity become problematic. Consequently, I propose that the lack of familiarity with an identity (because family members have no experience in such an identity) might best be overcome by developing networks that emphasize the (new) college student identity.

The independent variable is identity, defined as a highly salient status that is chosen, not imposed. This is defined in terms of role behavior, defined as a collection of actions and attitudes associated with a particular identity. This can be further split into two parts: 1) institutional role behavior, which is behavior directly related to the goals of an institution and 2) social network role behavior, which is behavior directly related to specific social network goals or resources. By this definition, an identity is any position in a social network that is chosen by the actor and not imposed upon him. It was important that the role be highly salient and chosen, in order for the actor to be easily aware of the identity to enable the push toward verification. Role behavior is the set of actions that is

associated with a certain identity. To measure how either the presence or lack of identity verification affects an actor, an actor's reported success at the behavior linked to the chosen identity (college performance) is the dependent variable. The scope conditions include: 1) ceteris paribus, 2) there must be a shift in identity, where the actor has taken on a new role, and 3) actors have the same general amount of financial resources.

This theoretical framework will be utilized when examining the experiences of first generation college students concerning identity formation and social networks. A first generation college student, by virtue of being first generation, does not have any personal or familial experience with university life. From the literature, this is seen as a lack of social capital being passed from the parent to the child. So, for a first generation college student, the identity of "college student" is a highly salient one wherein the actor has little experience. Concerning role behavior, first generation college students, by virtue of having differing social networks than second generation college students, will have more gaps in institutional and social network role behaviors. For this study, institutional role behaviors are those that are directly related to the institution (university) whereas social network role behaviors are those that are related to specific social network goals or resources (such as organizations or work). When the overlap between social network and institutional behavior is high, by definition, there should be a greater chance at succeeding at the overlapping goals. The scope conditions of the theoretical framework are met by looking at first generation college students, in that there is a shift to a new identity where the actor has little experience.

I predict that the data will show that first generation college students who have more college oriented overlap in their institutional and social network role behavior will be more successful in their educational endeavors. Furthermore, compared to non-first generation college students, overall, first generation college students will be less successful at goal completion than their non-first generation peers.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Sample

To test my predictions, I used data available from a large university in the south-west. At this university, there is a university-based scholarship ("Varsity Scholarship") that is given only to first generation college students that are deemed as having "high need" through the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). These students ("Varsity Scholars") must have a family income of under $40,000 to qualify. In order to receive and maintain the scholarship, in the first year the student must live on campus, join a learning community and attend two meetings: the orientation and the end-of-year banquet. These requirements are only for the freshman year. As part of the program, self-evaluations are performed every year on various aspects of the program (it has grown much since its conception just a few years back). Students (Varsity Scholars, non-VS first generation students, and non-first generation students) were sent a link to an online survey to complete a questionnaire about their first year at Southwest University. This data is made public through OISP (The Office of Institutional Studies and Planning) and I was granted access to the year-end assessment from 2006.

A link to an online survey was sent to 2,535 students, including Varsity Scholars, first generation non-VS, and non-first generation students. 814 students responded, a re-sponse rate of about 32%. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the sample by sex and Table 2 shows the breakdown by ethnicity. The tables show that about 60% of the sample is

female and 56% of the sample is white. The variable White was recoded from the original question concerning ethnicity because there was not enough variation in the responses to warrant so many categories. To see the original breakdown by differing groups, see Appendix Table A-1.

Table 1: *Total Respondents Divided by Gender*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	330	40.6	40.7	40.7
	Female	480	59.1	59.3	100.0
	Total	810	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.2		
Total		812	100.0		

Table 2: *Total Respondents Divided by Ethnicity (White/Non-White)*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Non-White	285	35.1	38.5	38.5
	White	456	56.2	61.5	100.0
	Total	741	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	71	8.7		
Total		812	100.0		

A variable concerning first generation status ("FG") was created in order to observe any differences between first generation status groups. Four groups were created to

measure first generation and Varsity Scholar status: 1) First Generation, Varsity; 2) First Generation, Non-Varsity; 3) Non-First Generation, Non-Varsity; and 4) Non-First Generation, Varsity. The fourth category is possible as the survey asked the respondent if they were the first to go to college when considering parents *and* siblings. Having an older sibling that has gone to college can be considered another type of social network for the respondent. You can see in Table 3, about 35% of the cases are first generation students, Varsity and non-Varsity combined. When looking at just Varsity scholars, about 32% of the sample has that scholarship.

Table 3: *Total Respondents Categorized by First Generation & Varsity Scholar Status*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	First Gen Varsity	181	22.3	22.6	22.6
	First Gen Non Varsity	105	12.9	13.1	35.7
	Non First Gen Non Varsity	442	54.4	55.1	90.8
	Non First Gen Varsity	74	9.1	9.2	100.0
	Total	802	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	1.2		
Total		812	100.0		

The dependent variable, Successful, is self-reported by the respondent in response to the question: “Based on your first semester’s performance, do you feel you

were academically successful at [Southern University]?" Table 4 shows that almost half of respondents self-reported they were academically successful in their first semester. "Other" refers to the combination of "No" and "Somewhat." To see the original break-down before recoding, see Appendix Table A-2.

Table 4: *Frequency of Responses Concerning Success in the First Semester (Yes/Other)*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other	416	51.2	51.5	51.5
	Yes	392	48.3	48.5	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Important role behaviors that are consistent with the academic college student identity are homework, being tutored and being involved in student organizations. The survey asked students to report how many hours per week (HPW) a student spent in certain activities. Table 5 shows HPW spent on homework, while Table 6 shows HPW spent engaged in tutoring.

Table 5: *Hours per Week Respondents Spent Doing Homework*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5 or less HPW	276	34.0	34.2	34.2
	6-10 HPW	225	27.7	27.8	62.0
	11-15 HPW	145	17.9	17.9	80.0
	16-20 HPW	80	9.9	9.9	89.9
	20 or more HPW	82	10.1	10.1	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Table 6: *Hours per Week Respondents Spent Engaged in Tutoring*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	219	27.0	27.1	27.1
	5 or less HPW	512	63.1	63.4	90.5
	6-10 HPW	50	6.2	6.2	96.7
	11-15 HPW	22	2.7	2.7	99.4
	16-20 HPW	1	.1	.1	99.5
	20 or more HPW	4	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Table 7: *Hours per Week Students Spent Involved in Organizations*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	145	17.9	17.9	17.9
	5 or less HPW	495	61.0	61.3	79.2
	6-10 HPW	88	10.8	10.9	90.1
	11-15 HPW	34	4.2	4.2	94.3
	16-20 HPW	18	2.2	2.2	96.5
	20 or more HPW	28	3.4	3.5	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Tables 5-7 show that most respondents spend 5 HPW or less on each of these three activities.

I felt that it was important to assess the behaviors consistent with the college student role and hold other variables known to be important constant. Consequently, I will consider the control variables of self-reported feelings of preparedness as well as how many hours per week they worked for pay. Preparedness is a variable that might include some aspects of social networks, but includes academic preparation as well. Work is an important control variable since hours spent working compete with hours spent in other activities. Tables 8 and 9 show that almost 50% felt that they were academically prepared for the University and nearly 75% do not work at all during the week. (To see the original breakdown of Prepared before recoding, see Appendix Table A-3.)

Table 8: *Frequency of Responses to the Question Concerning their Self-Reported Feelings Regarding Being Prepared for Their First Semester*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other	417	51.4	51.4	51.4
	Yes	395	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	812	100.0	100.0	

Table 9: *Hours per Week Respondents Spent Working for Pay*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	603	74.3	74.4	74.4
	5 or less HPW	50	6.2	6.2	80.6
	6-10 HPW	38	4.7	4.7	85.3
	11-15 HPW	53	6.5	6.5	91.9
	16-20 HPW	40	4.9	4.9	96.8
	20 or more HPW	26	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total	810	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.2		
Total		812	100.0		

Measures and Analysis

The collected data is able to pinpoint my theoretical questions in numerous ways. The survey asks the student if they are a Varsity Scholar, as well as asking "Did either your mother or father graduate from college?" in addition to "Are you the first member

of your family (parents, siblings) to attend college?" By asking these three questions, we will be able to ascertain if the student is a Varsity Scholar, a non-Varsity Scholar first generation student, or neither (non-first generation student).

I am able to perform analysis on social networks through the various questions concerning the student's involvement in: working for pay, organizations, learning communities, etc. With my independent variable, in order to measure a student's consistency, I looked at involvement (hours per week) in three different activities: student organizations, tutoring, and homework. The intent is to look at how the student actually spends his time (behavior) in terms of it being consistent with the role identity, that is, the time spent engaging in activities that are directed towards completing institutional goals. Those that spend more hours per week engaged in such activities will be considered as being "consistent" with institutional goals. I also wanted to look at the effect learning communities[1] had on self-reported student success. Learning communities are designed to serve as important networks and are structured toward institutional goals of academic success. Only about 33% of the respondents were involved in a learning community (see Appendix Table A-4).

I expect that first generation students who have more consistent networks directed toward college will be more successful in college than first generation students with less. I also suspect that compared to first generation students, non-first generation will be more likely to rank themselves as successful.

---

[1] A *learning community* is a multi-disciplinary effort to aid in the transition to college through academic assistance, social outings and professional (advising/counseling) contacts.

The dependent variable is their self-evaluation of success ("Successful") in their college program based on their first semester. The dependent variable was recoded from an ordinal variable (See Appendix Table A-2) into a dichotomous variable in order to run a binomial logistic regression. It would have been preferable to run an ordered logistic regression using the original ordered categories ("Yes/No/Somewhat") but that was not possible due to the warnings associated with too many empty cells. Because of this, I chose to do a binomial logistic regression in two different capacities with a dichotomous dependent variable with categories of "Yes/Other" (see Table 5) where "Other" includes both "Somewhat and No" as well as look at the extremes of "Yes/No" (see Appendix Table A-5). My control variables include: sex (see Table 1), ethnicity (see Table 2), self-reported academic preparedness (see Table 8) and hours per week spent working for pay (see Table 9). Like academic success, academic preparedness was also recoded into "Yes/No" categories in order to look at extremes (see Appendix Table A-6).

Results

As previously mentioned, I used binomial logistic regression to test my theory. The tables will be shown in two groups in order to highlight the differences between the two dependent variables "Successful" (coded Yes/Other) and "SuccessfulYN" (coded "Yes/No"). First, I conducted an analysis in which the only independent variable is whether or not the student was a first generation student (see Appendix Tables A-9 & A-10). This shows that looking only at first generation status, first generation students are less likely to self-report academic success compared to non-first generation students.

However, first generation status is mitigated by other variables once they are introduced into the regression.

Tables 10 & 11 show the regression results when first generation status is included as a variable. The variable "FirstGen" is a dichotomous variable with the value 1 meaning the student is a first generation student. In either table, first generation status is not significant at the 0.05 level. However, we can use this information to see the effect on the other variables in regards to likelihood of reporting academic success.

Tables 10 & 11 have the same variables as significant (homework, tutoring, preparedness), with the exception of Table 10 showing ethnicity (white/non-white) as significant and Table 11 showing learning communities as significant when the dependent variable is recoded to "Yes/No." Looking at the odds ratio for homework on Table 10 (Exp(B)), we can see that the more a hours per week a student engages in homework, all else equal, they are 28% more likely to self-report academic success in their first semester. Tutoring in both tables has a negative effect rather than the expected positive effect. So, the more a student engages in tutoring, the less likely they are to report academic success. A possible explanation for this odd negative relationship can be that those students that are more involved with tutoring may be those that are struggling academically and therefore are less likely to claim academic success. For Table 10, all else being equal, whites are 87% more likely to report academic success than non-whites. The variable concerning preparedness is always statistically significant (in every table).

Table 10: *Binomial Logistic Regression with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other) also Controlling for First Generation Status*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.253	.072	12.359	1	.000*	1.288
	Tutor	-.322	.131	6.008	1	.014*	.725
	Orgs	-.092	.085	1.171	1	.279	.912
	Female	.125	.179	.487	1	.485	1.133
	White	.627	.197	10.147	1	.001*	1.872
	Work	.008	.064	.017	1	.896	1.008
	Prepared	2.018	.177	130.155	1	.000*	7.526
	LearningComm	.292	.197	2.200	1	.138	1.339
	FirstGen	.071	.201	.124	1	.725	1.073
	Constant	-1.848	.307	36.178	1	.000	.158

N=714 * $p < 0.05$

Table 11: *Binomial Logistic Regression with Dependent Variable SuccessfulYN (Yes/No) also Controlling for First Generation Status*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.359	.110	10.743	1	.001*	1.432
	Tutor	-.415	.177	5.468	1	.019*	.661
	Orgs	-.159	.122	1.682	1	.195	.853
	Female	.175	.253	.477	1	.490	1.191
	White	.454	.277	2.681	1	.102	1.575
	Work	.059	.088	.455	1	.500	1.061
	Prepared	2.446	.269	82.445	1	.000*	11.548
	LearningComm	.583	.288	4.088	1	.043*	1.791
	FirstGen	-.129	.286	.205	1	.650	.879
	Constant	-.904	.401	5.087	1	.024	.405

N= 471 * $p < 0.05$

Tables 12 & 13 are binomial logistic regressions, selecting **all** first generation students, regardless of varsity scholarship status. I temporarily selected FG =1 (first generation, varsity scholars) and FG = 2 (first generation, non-varsity scholars) to see the results when looking only at first generation students. We can see on Table 12 that the only significant variable is prepared. On Table 13 however, when the dependent variable is recoded to "Yes/No", homework, organizations, work, and prepared are significant. Looking at this table, all else being equal, those that spend more hours per week engaged in homework are one and a half times more likely to report academic success, while those that worked for pay are 37% *more* likely to report academic success. This is definitely a surprise, as you would expect that a student that has to work more has less time to devote to studies, therefore decreasing chances of academic success.

Table 12: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation Students (FG=1 or 2) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.182	.113	2.609	1	.106	1.199
	Tutor	-.263	.215	1.500	1	.221	.769
	Orgs	-.121	.149	.661	1	.416	.886
	Female	.035	.290	.015	1	.904	1.036
	White	.227	.306	.552	1	.458	1.255
	Work	.157	.096	2.650	1	.104	1.170
	Prepared	1.886	.291	42.028	1	.000*	6.591
	LearningComm	.348	.288	1.457	1	.227	1.416
	Constant	-1.513	.442	11.706	1	.001	.220

N=260 * $p < 0.05$

Table 13: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation Students (FG=1 or 2) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.458	.178	6.637	1	.010*	1.581
	Tutor	-.452	.285	2.515	1	.113	.636
	Orgs	-.407	.205	3.919	1	.048*	.666
	Female	.097	.408	.057	1	.811	1.102
	White	-.136	.426	.102	1	.749	.873
	Work	.315	.141	4.960	1	.026*	1.370
	Prepared	2.431	.453	28.795	1	.000*	11.374
	LearningComm	.366	.397	.850	1	.356	1.442
	Constant	-.734	.554	1.759	1	.185	.480

N=167 * $p < 0.05$

To contrast that information, I also temporarily selected FG =3 (non-first generation, non-varsity scholars) and FG = 4 (non-first generation, varsity scholars) to see the results when looking only at non-first generation students. Tables 14 & 15 show the results. Looking at Table 14, we can see that, all else being equal, the more a student engages in homework, they are 35% more likely to report academic success. White students are two and a half times more likely to report academic success than non-white students. Table 15 also shows homework being important, with those engaging in more hours per week having a 42% more likelihood of reporting academic success. In this table, whites are nearly three times more likely than non-whites to report being academically successful[2].

[2] To see the regression breakdown by first generation and varsity student status, see Appendix Tables A-7.1-4 and A-8.1-4.

Table 14: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation Students (FG=3 or 4) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.301	.096	9.888	1	.002*	1.351
	Tutor	-.437	.177	6.056	1	.014*	.646
	Orgs	-.071	.108	.434	1	.510	.931
	Female	.244	.233	1.098	1	.295	1.276
	White	.905	.265	11.627	1	.001*	2.473
	Work	-.106	.086	1.507	1	.220	.900
	Prepared	2.121	.228	86.827	1	.000*	8.338
	LearningComm	.272	.273	1.000	1	.317	1.313
	Constant	-2.143	.405	27.978	1	.000	.117

N=454 * $p < 0.05$

Table 15: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation Students (FG=3 or 4) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.351	.149	5.518	1	.019*	1.420
	Tutor	-.545	.255	4.553	1	.033*	.580
	Orgs	.006	.163	.002	1	.968	1.006
	Female	.364	.341	1.139	1	.286	1.439
	White	1.026	.385	7.113	1	.008*	2.790
	Work	-.159	.120	1.752	1	.186	.853
	Prepared	2.566	.353	52.924	1	.000*	13.011
	LearningComm	.937	.456	4.223	1	.040*	2.552
	Constant	-1.443	.558	6.684	1	.010	.236

N=304 * $p < 0.05$

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

First generation students are less likely to attend college than other students. I suggested that part of the reason this might be the case is that the adoption of the identity of "college student" is more foreign to those whose parents and family members have no exposure to college. One way that this unfamiliarity is changed is through the role behaviors consistent with the college student identity. I predicted that when first generation students were engaged in networks and role behavior that reinforced the college student academic identity, they would report that they were more successful in academics. I also predicted that, controlling for important theoretical factors, first generation students would still be disadvantaged relative to non-first generation college students.

To test these ideas, I used survey data collected from a large university in the southwest. The survey asked freshman respondents to reflect upon their experience in the program. The survey was self reported and did not contain actual information on grade points or other objective measures. The dependent variable of interest was the respondents' assessment of academic success in their first semester.

My second hypothesis, that first generation students, controlling for other theoretically relevant factors, would still be negatively affected was not supported. My first hypothesis, that consistency between identity and role performance consistent with a college student, was partially supported.

Homework is consistently significant and shows that the more hours per week a student spends doing homework, the more likely he is to self-report academic success. Tutoring has a surprising negative relationship with academic success, but it could be that those students that spend many hours per week being tutored are those that are struggling with academics, and will be less likely to report academic success. In other words, students seem to view tutoring as a "last resort." Membership in a learning community was significant and seemed to have a positive effect on self-reported academic success. Sex was not significant in any of the models, suggesting that self-reported academic success is not affected by gender. Being involved in organizations was also not significant in terms of self-reported academic success. However, ethnicity was significant. Whites were much more likely to self-report academic success than non-whites.

There are many limitations in the data. First, there is a low response rate and therefore no guarantee on the randomness of the sample. It may be, for example, that the people who answered the survey have different characteristics from those who did not respond. Additionally, the survey contained self report measures and there are a number of well-known problems of self report measures, including pressure toward responding in socially approved responses. This particular problem is less an issue in this survey because responses were anonymous. However, given that I am interested in academic success, actual measures of success, GPA for example, would be preferable. Finally, all the respondents were students accepted by the same university. In some ways, this is a limitation if the interest was in generalizing the results to different universities. But, given

that I was testing particular predictions about the role of identities, this is not a large limitation.

In one large way, the results are discouraging: being a minority decreased chances for success. Some of this may result from the fact that the university I consider has relatively few minority students relative to the state in which it is situated. This would suggest that more attention should be given to increasing the supportive networks for minority students.

In many ways, the results are encouraging. They seem to suggest that being a first generation college student is a disadvantage that can be overcome. This is an important concept, as literature shows that first generation students start college with a disadvantage compared to non-first generation students. This disadvantage was also evident with the students who were the subject of my analysis. That is, without consideration of any other factors, being a first generation student was a negative factor for self reported academic success. However, this initial disadvantage could be changed (see Appendix Tables A-9 & A-10). With the correct support networks in place, first generation students can succeed and overcome their disadvantage. In particular, one of the control variables, "preparedness" was important for all groups. This suggests that high schools, can indeed prepare students for college. Or at least this is suggested, because, we do not know for sure what factors enter into preparedness. Also, being a member of a learning community was significant; this implies that the policy of strongly recommending involvement in these communities is warranted. A learning community provides students

with a support network academically, socially, and professionally. Students are able, through these learning communities, to receive help with homework, personal troubles, as well as make new friends. And finally, the results indicate what professors have long admonished students: homework really is important.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241-258 in *Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J.E. Richardson. New York, New York: Greenwood Press.

Burke, Peter. 2004. "Identities and Social Structure: The 2003 Cooley-Mead Award Address." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67:5-15.

Burke, Peter. 2007. "Identity Control Theory." Prepared for George Ritzer (ed.) *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. 1-7. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Co.

Burke, Peter and Alicia Cast. 1997. "Stability and Change in the Gender Identities of Newly Married Couples." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60:277-290.

Burke, Peter and Michael Harrod. 2005. "Too Much of a Good Thing?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:359-374.

Burke, Peter and Donald Reitzes. 1981. "The Link Between Identity and Role Performance." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 44:83-92.

Burke, Peter and Jan Stets. 1999. "Trust and Commitment through Self-Verification." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:347-360.

Cast, Alicia. 2003. "Power and the Ability to Define the Situation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66:185-201.

Cast, Alicia, Jan Stets and Peter Burke. 1999. "Does the Self Conform to the Views of Others?" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:68-82.

Coleman, James. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:95-120.

Cutler, David M., Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2010. "Understanding Differences in Health Behaviors by Education." *Journal of Health Economics* 29:1-28.

Davern, Michael. 1997. "Social Networks and Economic Sociology: A Proposed Research Agenda for a More Complete Social Science." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 56:287-302.

Davis-Kean, Pamela E. 2005. "The Influence of Parent Education and Family Income on Child Achievement: The Indirect Role of Parental Expectations and the Home Environment." *Journal of Family Psychology* 19(2):294-304.

Day, Jennifer Cheeseman and Eric C. Newburger (2002). "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-life Earnings." (Current Population Reports, Special Studies, P23-210). Washington, DC: Commerce Dept., Economics and Statistics Administration, Census Bureau. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf

Dearing, Eric, Kathleen McCartney, and Beck A. Taylor. 2001. "Change in Family Income Matters More for Children with Less." *Child Development* 72:1779-11793.

Dubow, Eric F., Paul Boxer, and L. Rowell Huesmann. 2009. "Long-term Effects of Parents' Education on Children's Educational and Occupational Success: Mediation by Family Interactions, Child Aggression, and Teenage Aspirations." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 55(3):224-249.

Fry, Richard. 2009. "College Enrollment Hit All-Time High, Fueled by Community College Surge." Pew Research Center: A Social and Demographic Trends Report. [online at http://pewsocialtrends.org]

Goddard, Roger. 2003. "Relational Networks, Social Trust, and Norms: A Social Capital Perspective on Students' Chances of Academic Success." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25:59-74.

Gofen, Anat. 2009. "Family Capital: How First Generation Higher Education Students Break the Intergenerational Cycle." *Family Relations* 58:104-120.

Heise, David. 2007. *Expressive Order: Confirming Sentiments in Social Actions.* New York: Springer.

Herndon, Michael and Joan Hirt. 2004. "Black Students and Their Families: What Leads to Success in College." *Journal of Black Studies* 34:489-513.

Horn, Laura, and Ann-Marie Nuñez. 2000. Mapping the Road to College: First-Generation Students' Math Track, Planning Strategies, and Context of Support (NCES 2000–153). U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ishitani, Terry. 2006. "Studying Attrition and Degree Completion Behavior among First Generation College Students in the United States." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77:861-885.

Kaplan, Howard B. 1986. *Social Psychology of Self-Referent Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

Kuh, George D., Ty M. Cruce, Rick Shoup, Jillian Kinzie, and Robert M. Gonyea. 2008. "Unmasking the Effects of Student Engagement on First-Year College Grades and Persistance." *The Journal of Higher Education* 79(5):540-563.

Lin, Nan. 1999. "Social Networks and Status Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:467-487.

Linsenmeier, David M., Harvey S. Rosen, and Cecilia Elena Rouse. 2006. "Financial Aid Packages and College Enrollment Decisions: An Econometric Case Study." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(1):126-145.

McNamara Horvat, Erin, Elliot Weininger, and Annette Lareau. 2003. "From Social Ties to Social Capital: Class Differences in the Relations Between Schools and Parent Networks." *American Education Research Journal* 40:319-351.

Olive, Tamara. 2008. "Desire for Higher Education in First Generation Hispanic College Students Enrolled in an Academic Support Program: A Phenomenological Analysis." *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* 39:81-110.

Orbe, Mark. 2008. "Theorizing Multidimensional Identity Negotiation: Reflections of the Lived Experiences of First Generation College Students." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 120:81–95.

Pascarella, Ernest, Christopher Pierson, Gregory Wolniak and Patrick Terezini. 2004. "First Generation College Students: Additional Evidence on College Experiences and Outcomes." *The Journal of Higher Education* 75:249-284.

Perna, Laura Walter. 2000. "Differences in the Decision to Attend College among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites." *The Journal of Higher Education* 71(2):117-141.

Perna, Laura Walter and Marvin A. Titus. 2005. "The Relationship between Parental Involvement as Social Capital and College Enrollment: An Examination of Racial/Ethnic Group Differences." *The Journal of Higher Education* 76(5):485-518.

Pike, Gary and George Kuh. 2005. "First and Second Generation College Students: A Comparison of Their Engagement and Intellectual Development." *The Journal of Higher Education* 76:276-300.

Ream, Robert. 2003. "Counterfeit Social Capital and Mexican-American Underachievement." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25:237-262.

Reid, M. Jeanne and James Moore, III. 2008. "College Readiness and Academic Preparation for Postsecondary Education: Oral Histories of First Generation Urban College Students." *Urban Education* 42:240-261.

Serpe, Richard. 1987. "Stability and Change in Self: A Structural Symbolic Interactionist Explanation." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50:44-55.

Stanton-Salazar, Ricardo and Sanford Dornbusch. 1995. "Social Capital and the Reproduction of Inequality: Information Networks among Mexican-Origin High School Students." *Social of Education* 68:116-135.

Stets, Jan and Peter Burke. 2000. "Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63:244-237.

Stets, Jan and Peter Burke. 2005. "Identity Verification, Control, and Aggression in Marriage." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:160-178.

Stryker, Sheldon and Peter Burke. 2000. "The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63:284-297.

Swann, William B. Jr., Christine Chang-Schneider and Katie Larsen McClarty. 2007. "Do People's Self-Views Matter? Self-Concept and Self-Esteem in Everyday Life." *American Psychological Association* 62(2):84-94.

Swann, William B. Jr., Angel Gomez, D. Conor Seyle, J. Francisco Morales and Carmen Huici. 2009. "Identity Fusion: The Interplay of Personal and Social Identities in

Extreme Group Behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96(5):995-1011.

Swann, William B. Jr., Laurie P. Milton, and Jeffrey T. Polzer. 2000. "Should We Create a Niche or Fall in Line? Identity Negotiation and Small Group Effectiveness." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79(2):238-250.

Swann, William B. Jr., Brett W. Pelham, and Douglas S. Krull. 1989. "Agreeable Fancy or Disagreeable Truth? Reconciling Self-Enhancement and Self-Verification." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57(5):782-791.

Swann, William B. Jr., Alan Stein-Seroussi, and R. Brian Giesler. 1992. "Why People Self-Verify." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62(3):392-401.

Thoits, Peggy A. 1995. "Stress, Coping and Social Support Processes: Where Are We? What Next?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 35:53-79.

Ting, Siu-Man. 2003. "A Longitudinal Study of Non-Cognitive Variables in Predicting Academic Success of First-Generation College Students." *College & University* 78(4):27-31.

Tsushima, Teresa and Peter Burke. 1999. "Levels, Agency, and Control in the Parent Identity." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:173-189.

U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. "Mapping the Road to College: First-Generation Students' Math Track, Planning

Strategies, and Context Support." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. [Online at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/2000153.pdf.]

Van der Klaauw, Wilbert. 2002. "Estimating the Effect of Financial Aid Offers on College Enrollment: A Regression-Discontinuity Approach." *International Economic Review* 43(4):1249-1287.

Vuong, Mui, Sharon Brown-Welty, and Susan Tracz. 2010. "The Effects of Self-Efficacy on Academic Success of First-Generation College Sophomore Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 51(1):50-64.

APPENDIX

Table A-1: *Original Breakdown of Ethnicity for Sample*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African American/Black	43	5.3	5.3	5.3
	Asian Ameri-can/Asian/Pacific Islander	36	4.4	4.5	9.8
	Caucasian	456	56.2	56.5	66.3
	Hispanic	197	24.3	24.4	90.7
	Multiracial	7	.9	.9	91.6
	Native American/American Indian	2	.2	.2	91.8
	Prefer not to answer	42	5.2	5.2	97.0
	Other	24	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	807	99.4	100.0	
Missing	No response	5	.6		
Total		812	100.0		

Table A-2: *Original Breakdown of Question: "Based on your first semester's performance, do you feel you were academically SUCCESSFUL at [Southern University]?"*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	392	48.3	48.5	48.5
	No	145	17.9	17.9	66.5
	Somewhat	271	33.4	33.5	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	No response	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Table A-3: *Original Breakdown of Question: "Based on your first semester's performance, do you feel you were academically PREPARED for [Southern University]?"*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	395	48.6	48.6	48.6
	No	152	18.7	18.7	67.4
	Somewhat	265	32.6	32.6	100.0
	Total	812	100.0	100.0	

Table A-4: *Breakdown of Student Involvement in Learning Communities.*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	544	67.0	67.3	67.3
	Yes	264	32.5	32.7	100.0
	Total	808	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		812	100.0		

Table A-5: *Recoding Academic Success into Dichotomous (Yes/No) Variable "SuccessfulYN"*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	145	17.9	27.0	27.0
	Yes	392	48.3	73.0	100.0
	Total	537	66.1	100.0	
Missing	System	275	33.9		
Total		812	100.0		

Table A-6: *Recoding Academic Preparedness into Dichotomous (Yes/No) Variable "PreparedYN"*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	152	18.7	27.8	27.8
	Yes	395	48.6	72.2	100.0
	Total	547	67.4	100.0	
Missing	System	265	32.6		
Total		812	100.0		

Table A-7.1: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation, Varsity Students (FG=1) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.243	.141	2.971	1	.085	1.275
	Tutor	.143	.306	.217	1	.641	1.153
	Orgs	-.296	.222	1.783	1	.182	.744
	Female	.209	.380	.303	1	.582	1.233
	White	.371	.452	.671	1	.413	1.449
	Work	.156	.125	1.552	1	.213	1.169
	Prepared	2.110	.379	30.976	1	.000	8.248
	LearningComm	.235	.383	.375	1	.540	1.264
	Constant	-2.019	.597	11.450	1	.001	.133

N=169

Table A-7.2: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation, Non-Varsity Students (FG=2) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.091	.203	.204	1	.652	1.096
	Tutor	-.881	.409	4.637	1	.031	.414
	Orgs	-.017	.227	.006	1	.939	.983
	Female	-.152	.490	.096	1	.757	.859
	White	-.091	.528	.030	1	.863	.913
	Work	.085	.168	.259	1	.611	1.089
	Prepared	1.505	.486	9.575	1	.002	4.506
	LearningComm	.486	.560	.753	1	.386	1.626
	Constant	-.371	.785	.224	1	.636	.690

N=91

Table A-7.3: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation, Non-Varsity Students (FG=3) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.279	.100	7.876	1	.005	1.322
	Tutor	-.456	.187	5.942	1	.015	.634
	Orgs	-.096	.112	.738	1	.390	.909
	Female	.126	.249	.257	1	.612	1.135
	White	.808	.311	6.725	1	.010	2.242
	Work	-.158	.092	2.925	1	.087	.854
	Prepared	2.089	.245	72.671	1	.000	8.075
	LearningComm	-.042	.317	.017	1	.896	.959
	Constant	-1.762	.461	14.582	1	.000	.172

N=388

Table A-7.4: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation, Varsity Students (FG=4) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/Other)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.471	.445	1.123	1	.289	1.602
	Tutor	-.266	.726	.134	1	.714	.767
	Orgs	-.177	.591	.090	1	.764	.838
	Female	1.943	.888	4.786	1	.029	6.976
	White	.683	.778	.769	1	.381	1.979
	Work	.261	.317	.680	1	.410	1.299
	Prepared	3.445	1.015	11.508	1	.001	31.331
	LearningComm	2.757	.992	7.725	1	.005	15.755
	Constant	-6.015	1.776	11.466	1	.001	.002

N=66

Table A-8.1: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation, Varsity Students (FG=1) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.726	.247	8.652	1	.003	2.067
	Tutor	.175	.464	.142	1	.706	1.191
	Orgs	-.847	.351	5.814	1	.016	.429
	Female	.771	.578	1.778	1	.182	2.162
	White	-.193	.705	.075	1	.784	.824
	Work	.337	.187	3.255	1	.071	1.401
	Prepared	3.078	.677	20.666	1	.000	21.718
	LearningComm	.650	.541	1.443	1	.230	1.916
	Constant	-2.243	.845	7.049	1	.008	.106

N=108

Table A-8.2: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting First Generation, Non-Varsity Students (FG=2) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.096	.333	.084	1	.773	1.101
	Tutor	-1.079	.482	5.014	1	.025	.340
	Orgs	-.159	.297	.287	1	.592	.853
	Female	-.544	.734	.548	1	.459	.581
	White	-1.084	.818	1.754	1	.185	.338
	Work	.224	.298	.563	1	.453	1.251
	Prepared	1.819	.722	6.347	1	.012	6.167
	LearningComm	.144	.794	.033	1	.856	1.155
	Constant	1.976	1.152	2.943	1	.086	7.216

N=59

Table A-8.3: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation, Non-Varsity Students (FG=3) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	.348	.154	5.121	1	.024	1.416
	Tutor	-.476	.263	3.283	1	.070	.621
	Orgs	-.032	.168	.037	1	.848	.968
	Female	.145	.363	.160	1	.689	1.156
	White	.792	.441	3.223	1	.073	2.207
	Work	-.149	.129	1.324	1	.250	.862
	Prepared	2.458	.369	44.456	1	.000	11.686
	LearningComm	.870	.577	2.276	1	.131	2.387
	Constant	-1.076	.631	2.906	1	.088	.341

N=269

Table A-8.4: *Binomial Logistic Regression Selecting Non-First Generation, Varsity Students (FG=4) with Dependent Variable Successful (Yes/No)*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Homework	-.322	.946	.116	1	.734	.725
	Tutor	-2.142	1.378	2.416	1	.120	.117
	Orgs	.773	1.271	.370	1	.543	2.167
	Female	3.346	1.716	3.804	1	.051	28.389
	White	2.260	1.837	1.513	1	.219	9.585
	Work	-.741	.799	.860	1	.354	.477
	Prepared	4.282	1.932	4.911	1	.027	72.416
	LearningComm	2.995	2.032	2.172	1	.141	19.986
	Constant	-2.815	1.913	2.167	1	.141	.060

N=35

Table A-9: Binary Logistic Regression of Successful (Yes/Other) and FirstGen

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	FirstGen	-.338	.149	5.168	1	.023	.713
	Constant	.070	.088	.633	1	.426	1.073

N=798

Table A-10: Binary Logistic Regression of SuccessfulYN (Yes/No) and FirstGen

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	FirstGen	-.592	.200	8.815	1	.003	.553
	Constant	1.223	.129	90.139	1	.000	3.397

N=533

VITA

NAME: Huong Thi Le

ADDRESS: MS 4351
Department of Sociology
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

EMAIL: huongy@tamu.edu

EDUCATION: B.A., Sociology, Texas A&M University, 2006.
M.S., Sociology, Texas A&M University, 2010.